



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/883,755	06/18/2001	Pavitra Subramaniam	5306P017	1735
8791	7590	03/02/2006	EXAMINER	
BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN 12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD SEVENTH FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030			ALAUBAIDI, HAYTHIM J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2168	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/883,755	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SUBRAMANIAM ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Haythim J. Alaubaidi	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 November 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-13,24,26-30,33-36,47,51,56-59,62,63,72-74,77 and 78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-7,10-13,24,26-30,33-36,47,51,56-59,62,63,72-74,77 and 78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 February 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/17/06</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is a Final Office Action in response to the amendment of November 30, 2005.
2. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51, 56-59, 62-63, 72-74 and 77-78 are presented for examination following the amendment of November 30, 2005.
3. Claims 1, 24, 47, 56, 72 are Independent Claims.
4. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51, 56-59, 62-63, 72-74 and 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

### *Response to Arguments*

5. Applicant's arguments filed in the amendment of November 30, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
  - a. Applicant argues that Green does not disclose the limitation of *"determining the first user's organizational identifier in response to the search request"* (Amendment of July 25, 2005, Page 13 of 16). The Examiner however disagrees. Green teaches, *"determining the first user's organizational identifier in response to the search request"*:  
  
(Green, Abstract), i.e.

"Qualified users may search for and access documents related to institution policies for review, including a list of those which the user is required to know. Where required, a test is provided to the user. The responses are scored and the results stored. Administrative users<sup>1</sup> can set

---

<sup>1</sup> Please note that "Administrative users" are users who are being identified by the system that are able to perform data manipulation other users can't. Administrative users are users with an organizational ID who are privileged with extra rights.

and change qualification parameters as to individual, group and/or institution-wide policy access and receive individual, group and/or institution-wide test results”

see also (Col 3, Lines 5-10, Lines 23-28 and Lines 49-52; see also Col 4, Lines 6-25; see also Col 6, Lines 16-22; see also Col 9, Line 49 through Col 10, Line 6; see also Col 11, Lines 49-59; see also Col 6, Lines 3-15, i.e. user attributes; see also defining a department)<sup>2</sup>.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1, 3-7, 10-13, 24, 26-30, 33-36, 47, 51, 56-59, 62-63, 72-74 and 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Gordon M. Green (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,598 and Green hereinafter) in view of Debora J. Byrne (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,619 and Byrne hereinafter) and further in view of Christian Mayaud (U.S. Patent No. 5,845,255 and Mayaud hereinafter).

---

<sup>2</sup> Please note that Green's system does determine the user's organizational ID in response to the search request, as Greens system determine an Administrative user from a Non-Administrative, for example, an

Regarding Claims 1, 13, 24, 47, 56, 72 and 78 Green discloses:

receiving a search request of search criteria from a first user (Col 2, Lines 15-17, i.e. A user can quickly access the set of policies for which he is responsible, or the set of policies which meet the user's search criteria; see also Col 7, Lines 42-46), wherein the search criteria includes at least one search category (Col 5, Line 54 through Col 6, Line 2);

determining the first user's organizational identifier in response to the search request;

please see Green, Abstract, i.e.

"Qualified users may search for and access documents related to institution policies for review, including a list of those which the user is required to know. Where required, a test is provided to the user. The responses are scored and the results stored. Administrative users<sup>3</sup> can set and change qualification parameters as to individual, group and/or institution-wide policy access and receive individual, group and/or institution-wide test results"

(see also Col 3, Lines 5-10, Lines 23-28 and Lines 49-52; see also Col 4, Lines 6-25; see also Col 6, Lines 16-22; see also Col 9, Line 49 through Col 10, Line 6; see also Col 11, Lines 49-59; see also Col 6, Lines 3-15, i.e. user attributes; see also defining a department); and

---

Administrative user can access the administrative functions based on a request to access such a function (Col 9, Lines 58-60) unlike a non-administrative user.

performing a search in one or more databases based on the search criteria (Col 4, Lines 48-63) to identify records that matches the search criteria and to which the first user is allowed to access (Col 7, Lines 8-13, i.e. and the document becomes available to qualified users for searches and display. The document can be located through the "search" and "browse" functions and is automatically included in the list of required policies for the appropriate users).

Green's reference discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except it does not explicitly indicate "performing a search in one or more databases based on the search criteria **and the first user's organizational identifier**". However Byrne teaches searching based on the first user's organizational identifier (Byrne, Abstract; see also Col 8, Lines 17-29).

Given the intended broad application of the Green's system, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of Green with the teachings of Byrne to add another attribute (organization based attribute) when conducting a search for data. Green does provide access restrictions to data that are sensitive or need not to be access by other groups. Byrne however, provides access control based on the user organization and the organization unit also. It would be obvious to combine both features of the references to maximize the flexibility of Greens system when adding another attribute, such as, the

---

<sup>3</sup> Please note that "Administrative users" are users who are being identified by the system that are able to perform data manipulation other users can't. Administrative users are users with an organizational ID who are privileged with extra rights.

user organization; another reason would be to increase access to certain data relating to certain user organization if the search was based on the user organization.

The combination of both Green and Byrne discloses all of the claimed subject matter set forth above, except they don't explicitly indicate wherein performing the search includes restricting the scope of search based on the first user's organizational identifier, which further includes selecting a subset of data records that match the first user's organizational identifier from a set of records that are associated with the at least one search category. However, Mayaud teaches wherein performing the search includes restricting the scope of search based on the first user's organizational identifier which further includes selecting a subset of data records that match the first user's organizational identifier from a set of records that are associated with the at least one search category (Mayaud, Col 10, Lines 11-19, i.e. parts thereof; see also Col 13, Lines 56-63; see also Col 17, Line 60 through Col 18, Line 5, i.e. who or what organization accessed the record, what part of the record was accessed; see also Col 18, Lines 6-23; see also Col 18, Lines 42-52).

Given the intended broad application of both Green and Byrne, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teachings of both Green and Byrne with the teachings of Mayaud to include this common database feature of access level to records, one reason would be to maintain privacy of some records, such as private information or sensitive information

while at the same time allowing access to other records that may not contain sensitive information.

Regarding Claims 3, 26 and 58, Green discloses keyword searching (Col 7, Lines 47-48, i.e. focused by the specified search criteria, a search is done for documents with matching keywords).

Regarding Claims 4-5 and 27-28, Green discloses associating a search category with a search index and then with a business component (Col 5, Line 54 through Col 6, Line 2, i.e. and a category hierarchy [index] is created; see also institution [business component]).

Regarding Claims 6 and 29, Green discloses wherein the business component is a database table (Col 5, Lines 54-56; see also Col 13, Lines 40-44).

Regarding Claims 7 and 30, Green discloses an interface (Col 7, Line 24; see also Line 32, i.e. automated searches; see also Line 42, i.e. choosing criteria; see also Col 11, Lines 49-59, i.e. search screen).

Regarding Claims 10-11, 33-34, 51, 62-63 and 77, the limitations of these claims are similar in scope to the rejected claims 1 and 3, above. They are therefore rejected as set forth above.



Regarding Claims 12 and 35, Green discloses structured query language (figures 10 and 11); see also Byrne, (Col 1, Lines 62-67 and Col 2, Lines 24-31).

Regarding Claim 36, the limitations of this claim are similar to Claim 1 and 13, above, which was rejected earlier. In edition Green discloses displaying the search results (Col 11, Lines 56-57).

Regarding Claims 57, Green discloses category searching (Col 4, Lines 36, i.e. The stored document selecting means includes means for locating documents based on the stored document categories).

Regarding Claims 59 and 74, Green discloses:

determining a list of users group to which the first user belongs (Col 14, Lines 27-29); and

determining one or more specific categories that are associated with the respective user group (Col 14, Lines 23-26).

Regarding Claim 73, the limitations of this claim is similar in scope to the rejected claims 2 and 3, above. It is therefore rejected as set forth above.

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

***Points of Contact***

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Haythim J. Alaubaidi whose telephone number is (571) 272-4014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic, can be reached on (571) 272-4023.

Any response to this office action should be mailed to:

The Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or Faxed at our central fax number (571) 273-8300.

Art Unit: 2168

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window of the  
Randolph Building at 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314



---

Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100  
Art Unit 2168



**TIM VO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**